

REMARKS

Claims 6-9, 12, 14 and 16-24 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-9, 12, 14 and 16-24 stand rejected under 35 U S C §103 as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,640 (DeMont) and U.S. Patent No. 6,253,075 (Beghtol). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons explained below.

Independent method claim 6 is directed to initiating a phone call between first and second users. A call initiation request is received from the first user representing a desire to establish a phone call with a specific second user identified by the first user. The call initiation request includes the primary phone number corresponding to the first user. The primary phone number is stored in computer readable memory. A request is made of the second user for authorization to initiate the call by which the second user must consent to the call. The primary phone number is dialed above receiving the authorization from the second user. Primary phone number is deleted from memory.

In the Office Action DeMont was relied upon for supplying the required teachings of claim 6 except for the requirement of storing the primary phone number in memory and deleting the primary phone number from memory. Beghtol was relied upon supply the latter teachings. Thus, only DeMont is relied upon for providing teachings regarding sending/receiving call initiation requests and authorization. As explained below, DeMont does not teach or render obvious the requirements of claim 6.

DeMont provides a plurality of beacons that transmit an identifying address, e.g. phone number, for an associated terminal (telephone set) so that any remote user's receiver within the range of the beacon can receive the identifying address; see FIG. 5. This

enables any remote user that can receive the beacon to be able to initiate a phone call based on the phone number received over the beacon. Once the remote user has received the phone number transmitted by the beacon, the remote user is immediately free to initiate a phone call to the received phone number without any further authorization.

DeMont does not provide teachings that correspond to be limitations of claim 6, especially as to the call initiation request and authorization limitations. Regardless of whether the remote user or the beacon in DeMont is considered to correspond to the first user in claim 6, neither assumption corresponds to the requirements of claim 6.

First, assume that the beacon and remote user in DeMont correspond to the first and second user, respectively, in claim 6. In this scenario it is clear that the first user (beacon) does not identify a specific second user (remote user). The very purpose all be beacon is to provide signals and information that can be received by a plurality of remote users. Further, the beacon does not implement a call initiation request; the beacon merely provides a continuous flow of information by which any remote user capable of receiving the signal transmitted by the beacon is provided with a telephone number.

Second, assume that the remote user and beacon in DeMont correspond to the first and second user, respectively, in claim 6. In this scenario, authorization is not requested from the second user (beacon) to initiate the call wherein the second user (beacon) consents to the call initiation. In the Office Action it was stated that "the alphanumeric tags displayed to the user is the request for authorization". However, it must be remembered that the alphanumeric tags are displayed to the remote user (first user) in this scenario. Hence, the display of the alphanumeric tags in DeMont cannot correspond to the required authorization request of the second user as per claim 6 in this scenario.

It should also be remembered that the actual party to be called in accordance with

DeMont plays no part in either the call initiation request or authorization. That is, the party having the phone number transmitted by the beacon is entirely passive and does not take part in call initiation or authorization in accordance with claim 6.

Therefore, DeMont as well as DeMont considered in view of Beghtol do not render the subject matter of claim 6 obvious.

Independent claims 14 and 22 are not rendered obvious in view of the applied references for similar reasons explained above with regard to claim 6.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles L. Warren, Reg. No. 27,407
630-584-9206 (home office)

Patti & Brill LLC.
Customer No. 32205